

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VII

NEW YORK, MARCH 28, 1914

No. 21

In view of the interest aroused by Madame Montessori's recent visit to this country, it may be worth while to call the attention of the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY to the fact that the chief features of the Montessori method (as described in the first article on the subject in McClure's Magazine, in May, 1911) for teaching young children are to be found in the educational text-book of Quintilian, who lived and taught in the first century A.D. and was Rome's greatest school-teacher. In a letter published in McClure's Magazine for October, 1911, I alluded briefly to this similarity. Madame Montessori emphasizes the use of the sense of touch in the first steps, especially in the teaching of writing:

There can be no doubt that the teaching of young children to write, without the slightest strain or effort, is the most striking and impressive of Maria Montessori's achievements.

Learning to write necessarily precedes learning to read:

First to write and then to read—for her method inverts the usual order in which these accomplishments are acquired.

The gradual improvement of her method is described as follows:

The apparatus that Maria Montessori had used in training feeble-minded pupils to write was both expensive and in some ways unpractical. She had begun with letters elaborately carved in wood. Then she had devised colored letters pasted on pasteboard, which she taught her pupils to trace, first with the forefinger, then with the first two fingers, and finally with a little stick, to teach the motion of the pen.

At a later time she, with her teachers, set to work to fabricate writing-letters of large size and of coarse black sandpaper, which they pasted on very smooth square white cards. . . . They were afterward supplemented by numerous letters cut out of paper, for laying on a table when the children tried to make words.

The children pass their fingers over the rough surface of the sandpaper and thus learn the forms of the letters through the sense of touch. It is furthermore stated that they do not "learn letters according to their regular succession in the alphabet".

With all this compare the words of Quintilian I.I.24 ff. (I quote from Watson's translation in Bohn's Classical Library):

For that at least, which I see practiced in regard

to most children, by no means pleases me, namely, that they learn the names and <alphabetical> order of the letters before they learn their shapes. This method hinders their recognition of them, as, while they follow their memory that takes the lead <rather, 'as long as they are under the influence of that memory image, i.e. of names and order, which came to them first'>, they do not fix their attention on the forms of the letters. This is the reason why teachers, even when they appear to have fixed them sufficiently in the minds of children, in the straight <i.e. alphabetical> order in which they are usually first written, make them go over them again the contrary way, and confuse them by variously changing the arrangement, until their pupils know them by their shape, not by their place. It will be best for children, therefore, to be taught the appearances and names of the letters at once <i.e. simultaneously>, as they are taught those of men. . . . I do not disapprove, however, the practice, which is well known, of giving children, for the sake of stimulating them to learn, ivory figures of letters to play with, or whatever else can be invented, in which that infantine age may take delight, and which may be pleasing to handle, look at, or name. But as soon as the child shall have begun to trace the forms of the letters, it will not be improper <inutile> that they should be cut for him, as exactly as possible, on a board, that his style <stilus> may be guided along them as along grooves, for he will then make no mistakes, as on wax (since he will be kept in by the edge on each side, and will be unable to stray beyond the boundary); and, by following these sure traces rapidly and frequently, he will form his hand <firmabit articulos>, and not require the assistance of a person to guide his hand with his own hand placed over it.

The most striking agreement between the two pedagogues is the utilization of the sense of touch in learning to write, and this involves also the learning of writing before reading. This strikes me as a distinctly common-sense method—though I profess no knowledge of primary methods. The other point of agreement is the learning of the letters without regard to their order in the alphabet. Besides, Madame Montessori's method is entirely in harmony with Quintilian's advice, I.I.20: "Let his instruction be an amusement to him; let him be questioned, and praised". It will be noticed that Madame Montessori's original plan of using incised wooden blocks comes nearest to Quintilian's plan. She abandoned this on account of its expense. The substitution of sandpaper made it necessary to find another method for teaching control of the pencil.

Her original method (and that of Quintilian) seems more economical in every way except financially. Quintilian does not, so far as I know, receive credit from Madame Montessori for suggesting these ideas to her. Probably she is unaware of the fact, though she no doubt read the passage long ago, even if only in translation.

I would observe finally that I had to consult Quintilian's words in the original in order to understand what the English translator meant. An English translation is often a help in reading a Latin book, but I have yet to find one English translation which is entirely intelligible without recourse to the original¹.

B. L. U.

THE DIRECT METHOD

The discussions of the use of the Direct Method in teaching Latin show that there are still a large number of teachers who prefer to abide by the old method. The reason for this, it seems to me, is not so much a doubt whether the Direct Method will accomplish what is claimed for it as a difference in purpose in teaching Latin. If that be true, it is evident that we shall not come to an understanding about methods until we agree in purpose.

If the main purpose in teaching Latin is to be formal mental discipline, if its educational value is to be measured according as it is distasteful and as it strains the mind to overcome meaningless difficulties, the traditional method unquestionably serves the purpose very well. But if the purpose of teaching Latin is to have the pupil learn the language, the present search for a new method is the best evidence that the old does not accomplish this. And it cannot be expected to do so. The old method is to teach Latin by means of translation and grammar. But everybody knows that to translate well is a task worthy of the best efforts of men as well versed in the two languages concerned as they are in their own mother-tongue. In order to translate, it is necessary first to understand thoroughly the original, to penetrate its very spirit, and then to restate it as closely as can be done in the idiom of the other language. The task, then, presupposes a thorough acquaintance with both languages. Says Dr. G. Stanley Hall (*Educational Problems* 2.262):

This art of many arts, translation, the tyros can only parody, and their babble-babel is a confusion of tongues. They cannot translate anything worth while, and the classicist who looks only at the ideal translation when he speaks <of the value of translation> in public, and not at the actual performance of his pupils in the class-room, lives in a Fool's Paradise.

¹ Reference may be made to a paper by Professor Bennett, *An Ancient Schoolmaster's Message to Present-Day Teachers*, which dealt interestingly with Quintilian, in *The Classical Journal* 4.149-164. This article drew forth a brief paper by Mr. Roy K. Hack, *Quintilian Again*, in *The Classical Journal* 5.161-164.

C. K.

The 'translating' done in teaching Latin is merely a mechanical device by which to find, through the application of fixed rules, a multitude of which must be continually kept in mind, the sense of the original. Certainly the process can be only artificial and mechanical.

Grammar is the *science* of language. The formulating of its rules is the result of careful observation and investigation on the part of men familiar with the facts that make up the rules. In all other sciences that method is now considered the best method of teaching which leads pupils, not from generalizations to the specific, but which leads over the same road by which the scientist reached his conclusions, through observation of phenomena and facts to the discovery of laws and rules. Why should not this be the right method also in teaching the science of language? If a practical way of doing this has not yet been found, that only shows that we must continue to search for the method suitable to language-teaching.

That the method of teaching Latin now in vogue is an excellent discipline can not be denied. But the question raised by many, Is it worth the price, is justified. And if people in general are convinced that other studies can be found which furnish an equally good mental discipline and at the same time make possible the acquisition of knowledge which is itself worth the time, then how, with our strongest convictions to the contrary, are we going to prevent our discipline being thrown overboard, unless we offer with our Latin something that is worth while, not only in discipline but also in content? But if we can teach Latin so that after a reasonably short time the pupil may be able to read Latin authors with pleasure and due appreciation of the content, instead of laboriously deciphering them by 'turning' them into English—and oh, such English!, then it will be possible to retain Latin in our High School curriculum. And there is no reason why a rational method which aims at actually learning the language should not offer just as good a discipline as a method devised merely for the sake of discipline. But the fact is that this method was not devised even for that purpose, but it is the spontaneous outgrowth of a condition, the condition that teachers of Latin no longer knew Latin as they did formerly, but were able to teach it only by some such mechanical device. And the discipline-sentiment was only adduced afterwards as an argument in favor of retaining this makeshift method.

A common argument in favor of the current method is that its main purpose is to furnish a training in English. The reply to this, that the same amount of time and energy applied directly to the study of good English authors and to English composition would yield larger returns, can be contradicted, but can hardly be disproven. But if our

pupils should after a few years be able to read Latin authors so as to be able to get the content directly from the Latin, and not only from a Latin English into which the reading is first 'turned' by a sort of mental chemistry, then the practice of *real* translation, of exactly restating the content, first well understood, in good, idiomatic English, will also render large returns in the way of giving our pupils a thorough training in good English.

Teachers trained and experienced in the old method will no doubt find it difficult to adapt themselves to the new. But for the subject of Latin in the High School curriculum it is now a question of to be or not to be, and a fair amount of enthusiasm for the cause should surely enable us to overcome all difficulties. However, I am confident that shortly a method will be found which will prove agreeable and easy to all teachers regardless of their training and former practice¹.

J. F. KARL SCHMIDT.

BETHANY LADIES' COLLEGE, Mankato, Minn.

THE GOLDEN HOUSE OF NERO

A valuable contribution to the history of the Golden House has recently been made by F. Weege, *Das Goldene Haus des Nero*, in the *Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 28 (1913), 127-244. It is somewhat surprising that the structure which amazed the ancient world by its size and splendor should still await extensive excavations. Some of the rooms were accessible in Renaissance times, and it is well known that Giovanni da Udine was so impressed by their paintings that he communicated his enthusiasm to Raphael, with the result that the Loggie in the Vatican bear witness to the direct influence of Roman upon Renaissance art. But systematic excavations were not begun until 1811-1814, under de Romanis, when some 48 rooms in the western wing were cleared and opened to the public. As many more, however, in the corresponding eastern wing, are still filled with earth, whose excavation may add important details to the history of art. A beginning has just been made, and it is to be hoped that Weege's further studies may result in a complete plan of the various rooms and a detailed account of their decoration.

The Golden House arose from Nero's desire to join his palace on the Palatine—which he thought too small—with the spacious gardens on the Esquiline and the Oppius. His plan was at first blocked by the fact that the intervening quarter was thickly populated. The *domus transitoria* was devised to meet this difficulty, but had been barely begun when

the great fire of July, 64, devastated this section of the city, and enabled him to realize his dream of a palace where he might live 'as becomes a man'. Some idea of the extent of this imperial villa may be gained from the fact that the park and the palace, according to Huelsen, covered about 125 acres, whereas St. Peter's, the Vatican and its gardens cover about 75. Weege has conveniently brought together all the ancient literature bearing upon this subject. In all of it the prevailing characteristic is the element of wonder.

Weege gives in detail the dramatic story of the destruction of the superstructure of the Golden House, barely 60 years after the death of its creator. Throughout the Middle Ages a few remains were visible, but the memory of the subterranean chambers seems to have been wholly lost. It is well known that the Laokoön group was found here in 1488, although it was not removed until 1506. Convincing proofs are adduced by the author to show that this group once occupied a large niche in a room (80, in his excellent plan) recently excavated in the eastern wing of the palace. During the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries many artists visited the various rooms still accessible and left, tourist-fashion, a record of their presence. Among the famous names are Giovanni da Udine, Polidoro Caravaggio, Pinturicchio, Domenichino, Nicholetto da Modena, Hubert Goltz, Karel van Mander and Simon Louis Du Ry. An exhaustive list of these artists, with references to their sketches and later work reproducing various details of the Golden House, forms one of the valuable features of Weege's article.

After describing graphically his difficulty in crawling about in rooms filled nearly to the ceiling, Weege discusses the plan of the rooms and their decorations. This plan, although a tentative one, is an improvement over that of de Romanis. Rooms 60, 70, and 80, never yet treated and scarcely known, are selected for special study. Of these rooms, 60, the *volta dorata*, is the most splendid. The ceiling, which gives the room its name, in spite of damage, is still a marvel of beauty, as the fine photographs and colored illustrations show. The brilliant reds and blues harmonize with the gilded stucco adornment to form a masterpiece of Roman painting. Among the subjects in the various fields are Hippolytus's departure for the hunt, Nymphs and Satyrs, and the loves of Ares and Aphrodite. Room 70 is a sort of corridor, 61 meters long and 4 meters wide. The ceiling, all that is visible, is again a work of art. If a trial excavation of about 6 meters along one of the walls, disclosing a fine landscape, is a criterion of the rest of the rooms, the history of painting has much to gain by the complete clearing of all the chambers. Room 80 was partially cleared in the spring of 1913. The colors of the ceiling are

¹It should be stated that Professor Schmidt submitted with his brief paper concrete specimens of the method he employs himself, a method which he regards as superior to the Direct Method. Unfortunately, the specimens were not available for printing in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

C. K.

fresh and fine. The wall paintings, however, were badly damaged. Among the subjects of the ceiling are the farewell of Hector and Andromache, unique among representations of that theme, and Paris and Helen. In this 'Trojan' room, the Laokoön group might well have found a place, although it is difficult to see why such a work should have been left when Apollodorus, Trajan's architect, prepared the foundations for the *thermae*.

Weege's study of the Golden House is the most elaborate that has yet been made. The publication for the first time of many sketches now scattered in various museums, which show careful study of the *aurea domus* by Italian artists, is an admirable feature of this work. The beautiful illustrations warrant the hope that the entire structure may be speedily cleared and that such paintings as appear may help to solve some of the problems of Roman art.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

J. G. WINTER.

REVIEW

A Literary History of Rome: From the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age. By J. Wight Duff. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1909). Pp. xvi + 695. \$4.00.

This book by Professor Duff, the latest extensive addition to an already large number of literary histories of Rome, is the tenth volume of The Library of Literary History. The others treat of India, Iceland, Armenia, Persia (in two volumes), Scotland, France, the Arabs, and Russia. In a collection so comprehensive one might expect to find a general survey of Latin literature throughout its entire course rather than a detailed treatment which carries us to the flood-tide of Roman literary achievement and leaves us suspended on the crest of a wave. As Persia has been deemed worthy of two volumes, it may well be that we are to be rescued from our precarious position by an additional tome. Certain it is that the omission of names like Suetonius, Tacitus, Pliny and a host of others would leave the general reader without a just estimate of the literary endeavors of the busy nation beside the Tiber. We have at any rate the consolation of knowing that it is not the 'better half' that is missing.

So great are the strides that have been made in literary scholarship and so bewildering to the general reader (and oftentimes to the investigator) are the minute researches of to-day, that it becomes necessary for some one with a sense of perspective to halt and to collect results for the layman.

This Professor Duff has attempted to do, not in a cold impersonal manner, but after the promptings of his own heart. One unconsciously forms impressions of the writer's personality and is almost inevitably

reminded of the words of Anatole France, who says that "when a man undertakes to talk about literature, he is really talking about himself, and that the critic ought to preface his discourse by some such phrase as: 'Ladies and gentlemen, I am about to speak of myself, apropos of Shakespeare or Racine or Pascal or Goethe'".

In spite of the fact that of all the authors mentioned Julius Caesar and possibly Lucretius may have been the only ones that were born at Rome, the book is called A Literary History of Rome, and rightly so; for the grandeur that was Rome proved a crucible that transmuted things provincial into things of the city. "The prevailing tendency of thought and ambition was centripetal, as in France it has been towards Paris", says Mr. Duff (4). After the Empire the literature is not so distinctly a literature of the Eternal City, and Rome began to lose her preëminence as a court of last resort.

Notwithstanding the imposing array of literary histories that tax our library shelves, we are glad to welcome the new arrival and to perform for it a rather belated *susceptio*. As is the case with so many English publications, the book is exceedingly light in weight, the paper good, the printing clear and distinct. It atones for its Cyclopean bulk by sustaining the reader's interest. In its general appreciation of literary compositions, it resembles to some extent Mackail's Latin Literature, though never speaking of 'cracker mottoes', and never coining startling phrases that glare at one from the page.

To regard it from the layman's standpoint, it fills a niche into which no other work fits. Some books consist mainly of literary criticism, with but a modicum of data; others are useful as handy reference manuals, but uninteresting; and still others, though indispensable for the scholar, have for the general reader too much of the atmosphere of a museum, where everything is dry and lifeless, and specimens are labelled so scientifically as to be confusing to the uninitiated. Professor Duff takes us out into the open where there are the pulsations of life. Those that follow him into this field of study *non passibus aequis* will find entertainment and instruction in his train, while the scholar, too, may profit by his companionship. The book might well lure on from page to page the general reader, the non-classicist as well as the neo-classicist, and the busy Latin teacher who wishes to trace the sequence of events in cause and effect, or who desires to

¹ B. L. Gildersleeve, *Hellas and Hesperia*, 18.

² It has been suggested that this state of affairs may be due to Roman matrons leaving the city, especially during the summer months, for more pleasant places during their accouchement. But as a matter of fact, we know definitely in the case of most writers that they were provincials by birth, and that, like Horace, they spread their wings beyond their ancestral nest and sought in Rome freer outlet for their ambitions.

invest with flesh and blood the shadowy figures that were the pioneers in Rome's literary history.

In accordance with the plan of the author to have a book "continuously readable", Latin quotations have been relegated to the foot-notes, and in their stead there appear in the text translations in which the writer has evidently taken pride, and which are uniformly good, as an effort has been made to catch the 'Sprachgefühl' of the original. Yet Professor Duff, like Homer, sometimes nods.

In a celebrated passage of the *Telamo*, Ennius thus reflects his Epicurean beliefs:

Ego deum genus esse semper dixi et dicam caelitem,

sed eos non curare opinor quid agat humanum genus,

nam si curent, bene bonis sit, male malis; quod nunc abest.

The translation runs as follows (p. 141): "There are gods; granted; but they do not care what man does; else good men would have a good time, and bad men a bad time, which is not the case", yet the clause *quid agat humanum genus* really means, 'how fares human kind'. The phrase "to have a good time" has, for an American at least, an unfortunate connotation. A revision might read, 'else it would be well with the good and ill with the bad, a state of affairs that does not now exist'.

In general, however, the author is successful in his effort to retain the crudities, archaisms, or beauties of the original. For instance, the "heavy plays on words and alliteration overdone" in Ennius's famous line

O Tite tute Tati tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti!
are represented by "For thyself, O Titus Tatius, thou tholedst those terrible troubles" (149).

Conspicuously absent are the usual appalling bibliographies, which, with their excess lumber, frequently frighten away one who does not care to become a mere 'hewer of wood'; but a judicious use of references and comments in the footnotes gives opportunity for the more exacting reader to test conclusions or to seek for fuller information. One can, to be sure, detect here and there instances of ultra-conservatism. Thus, Birt's tempting, if not conclusive, interpretation³ of the Arval song, so far from being incorporated in the text, is not even mentioned in a foot-note.

Similar caution has been manifested in avoiding protracted discussion of the question whether the celebrated *phaselus* of Catullus came or could come up the Po and the Mincio to the Lago di Garda. The matter is summarily dismissed with the statement (312) that Catullus "was well enough off . . . to sail home from the East in his own yacht".

³ Th. Birt, *Das Arvallied*, Archiv 11. 149 ff. Of course, Birt's results need not be considered final, as is shown by an article of J. M. Stowasser, *Das Gebet der Arvalbrüder*, Wiener Studien, 15.78 ff.

Professor Duff holds that the principles, aspirations and aesthetics of the civilization remained typically Roman, in spite of the inrush of Greek influences. "The Roman borrowed in a Roman way", he says in a terse and pregnant statement that is just as applicable to other fields of activity as to literature. This faculty of the Romans Professor Knapp has aptly characterized in another connection as "assimilative originality".

We hear too much about the imitative character of Latin literature. The unfortunate fad of comparing Greek and Latin, so much to the detriment of the latter, we should, perhaps, attribute to the superlative influence of Cicero, who was never privileged to read the stirring odes of Horace or to be swept along by the dactylic surge of Vergil.

To those who would reëcho Cicero's dictum, *Doctrina Graecia nos et omni litterarum genere superabat*, in quo erat facile vincere non repugnantes (*Tusc. Disp.* 1.3), we might reply in Vergil's words: 'It is easier to steal the club of Hercules than it is to render a line of Homer'.

The native genius of a practical people like the Romans, so radically different from their neighbors in ideals and temperament, could not be readily crushed, nor could imagination be instilled by external rules of art. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*.

"Roman literature, as the written expression of the national genius, cannot be understood", says Professor Duff, "independently of the circumstances and races which determined the character of the people" (3). With this idea in mind, and that the reader may more fully realize the persistence of national traits and their evolution into the finished productions of the Golden Age, four brief chapters of a general nature have been introduced, as follows: (1) A Foreword on Environment (3-5); (2) The Origins-Geographical and Tribal (6-17)*;

* A recent definite statement is found in G. Friedrich's edition of Catullus (p. 100): "Der *phaselus* ist, wo der Mincio aufhörte schiffbar zu sein, zu Lande weiter transportiert und endlich über den schmalen Hals geschafft worden, der Sirmio mit der *campagna* verbindet, *ad lacum*". (See, however, Mr. Hurlbut's note On Catullus's *Phaselus ille*, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.125, and his further comment on the subject in 6.47. C. K.)

³ How the despised *opici* of Italy retained under the incrustation of Greek influence the only originality possible, that of personality, is well described by Professor Knapp in his monograph on *The Originality of Latin Literature*, THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL, 3. 251-260, 299-307. The advent of Greek influence might be not inaptly compared to Norman influence in England. It seems probable that the Conquest made no break in popular literature. During the two centuries that followed Hastings, England managed to keep "the essence of her language and national genius substantially unchanged" (Pancoast, *Introduction to English Literature*, 61).

⁴ This chapter drives home the truism that the nations which are the greatest contributors to civilization are a blending of several racial stocks. The cosmopolitan character of the early population of Italy is brought into clear relief by Peet's Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy and Sicily, for a reference to which the reader might, perhaps, be thankful. The rise of the Latin as the national speech was, of course, due to the great city growing up on the banks of the Tiber, just as, in fourteenth century England, the East Midland English spoken in and about London asserted itself over the Northern and Southern English and became the national speech.

(3) The Latin Language—Its History and Qualities (17-38); (4) The Roman Character and Religion (39-60).

From these chapters one may conclude that Professor Duff's idea of literary history corresponds with Sempronius Asellio's conception of *historia* as distinguished from *Annales*: *Nobis non modo satis esse video, quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam, quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent, demonstrare*. The work might indeed have been aptly called *A Genetic Literary History of Rome*. Certainly the disjointed dictionary effect of some of our more compendious literary histories is happily absent.

Given the premises of the introductory chapters, the results are as inevitable as a proposition in geometry. The same elements of durability, stability and fixity of character that manifested themselves in a Roman engineering feat were displayed in literary achievements. In general it might be stated that from no other history of similar or even greater compass, unless from Croiset's, would one be brought to a clearer realization of the fact that the literature is but a reflection of the character of the people, and that this character was too well defined and too marked to be made over anew by the Greeks.

There are so many striking analogues between Latin and English literatures that one wonders at their omission from a popular treatment. Thus an interesting parallel might have been drawn in connection with the statement (118) that "The exaltation of the national victory in the first Punic War created the aesthetic literature of Rome". The first results were the presentation of a regular comedy and tragedy that replaced the plotless *Satura*. This step was in recognition of Rome's newly-won position as a world-power. So among the native forces that shaped the new English drama was the intense patriotic pride which in the days of the Armada stirred England to a more widespread interest in her history, and to a warmer pleasure in the image of her triumphs. The English historical plays that followed the ransacking of the chronicle histories were more important than the corresponding Latin *praetextae*, because England had a Shakespeare to follow in their wake and Rome had not.

As the initial dramatic productions at Rome were patterned after foreign models, so in England the first regular comedy, the Ralph Roister Doister of Nicholas Udall, was written in imitation of the Latin comic dramatist Plautus; the first tragedy, the Gorboduc of Sackville and Norton, followed the style of the Latin tragic poet Seneca.

Prior to Andronicus, the Roman with literary tastes had to resort to the Greek, and likewise in early Elizabethan days the Classics were in vogue, but, just as the Roman personality and temperament

persisted, so "the forces creating a drama in England were too strong and original to make it a mere classic imitation; it might borrow from Italy and Rome, but had vitality and character of its own".

From this point the comments of the reviewer will follow the sequence of the statements of Professor Duff's that prompted them.

In speaking of the birth of the nationalistic literature after the first Punic War (119), the author quotes Porcius Licinus without, however, offering any explanation of the chronological mistake in *secundo*:

Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu
Intulit se bellicosum in Romuli gentem feram*.

The treatment of the earlier poets seems to the reviewer particularly sane. Although the crudity of the initial compositions is, of course, admitted, Professor Duff is not so unfair as to compare the efforts of pioneer days with the polished works of the time of Augustus. It is refreshing to find an occasional Roman, too, who realized the historical importance of these early endeavors, as, for instance, Propertius, who was willing to bestow upon Ennius's poems a crown, shaggy though it was (4. 1.61):

Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona.

The introduction of the hexameter by Ennius was probably as startling in Italy as the advent of blank verse in England.

In connection with Ennius, one misses Cicero's charming story of the bard's interchange of visits with Nasica. The passing reference to it in a footnote is hardly enough for a treasure so intensely human.

The usual amount of space is devoted to a discussion of the dates of the birth and the death of Plautus and Terence. The fact may well be that they themselves, owing to their humble origin, did not know their birth-years.

After remarking that "Plautine prosody is notoriously hard" (197), Professor Duff vouchsafes the astounding information that "the law of length by position was not yet in force". *Ubinam gentium sumus?* No wonder Plautine prosody is notoriously hard! Were the statement true, the law of *breves breviantes* would apply only to syllables long by nature. Strict application of such a dictum would make the *Menaechmi* a still greater comedy of errors. It is hardly conceivable that our author means what he says. Possibly having in mind the failure

* Pancoast, Introduction to English Literature, 127.

* Leo (Plautinische Forschungen, 58-59) has shown that Licinus was under the impression that the beginnings of Roman poetry dated from the period of the second Punic War. A somewhat similar error was made by Accius in confusing the first and second attacks upon Tarentum, and, as a result, concluding that Livius Andronicus was taken prisoner in 209 B.C. For this blunder Cicero criticizes Accius and establishes beyond refutation the *locus a quo* for Greek influence in Italian literature (Brutus, 71-72).

of final *s* to make position before a consonant, and the similar failure of a mute before a liquid, and the sporadic shortening of certain initial syllables as in *ille*, *inde*, etc., he intended to signify that the law was not yet in full force.

Teachers of Cicero's orations will find especially interesting the chapter on The Progress of Prose. Herculean strides had to be made, of course, before Cicero's polished art was possible. The Latin word *prosa* (*proversa*) is a tacit admission of the prior existence of poetry. The idea that it was possible to invest prose with literary attributes would seem to have been as novel in Italy as it had been in Greece.

Another comparison that might have been profitably made for the general student concerns the historical records before Cato's day, of which Professor Duff gives a good summary. These resembled in their fragmentary form the English accounts as they existed before Alfred and his Chronicles. As the rise of English prose dates from the court of Alfred at Winchester, so Cato is the father of Latin prose. There is, however, one striking difference between the two. Alfred realized with misgiving that his contributions, particularly as translator, meant the decline of Latin learning, whereas Cato felt great satisfaction in showing Albinus and others of his ilk that it was not necessary to have recourse to a foreign tongue, the Greek.

"We are not in a position", says Professor Duff (255), "to assess the oratorical worth of Cato's contemporaries". This is true, yet in a way we are not entirely at sea. We may take at its face value Gellius's significant statement that Cato was not content with the oratory of his own age. Recognition by Cato of the glaring faults of his contemporaries was a great step forward, and we may feel sure that there was much clear water between him and his rivals. The fact that we have record of nearly 90 of his 150 speeches and so little mention of competitors is proof that they were following afar off.

Cato's 'snap-shot' picture of the ideal orator was *vir bonus dicendi peritus*. The man and the orator were not yet differentiated. In technique oratory had some distance to go, and in ideals some descent to make, before the days of Cicero. We are perhaps now returning to Cato's idea, as is evidenced by Henry Ward Beecher's definition of oratory as "the art of influencing conduct with the truth sent home by all the resources of the living man".

Since a chapter of twenty pages has been devoted to the progress of early republican prose, one is disappointed that there is no analysis of its final

evolution in the hands of him whose name is 'not so much the name of a man as of eloquence itself'. The general reader would, no doubt, wonder by what method Cicero hammered the Latin into a facile medium of expression.

Naturally all accounts of Cicero speak of his humble parentage. The orator is in fact fond of posing as a self-made man, for from our point of view that is what a *novus homo* is. An interesting side-light found in Tacitus (Dial. 37) informs us that it was Catiline, Verres, Milo and Mark Antony that shed so much glory round the orator by providing him an opportunity to display his powers.

Professor Duff barely mentions Cicero's poor health in early life, yet it is interesting to note that the peerless Roman orator had, like Demosthenes, physical limitations which served only as a challenge to override them. Thus we learn from the Brutus (313) that his throat and constitution, which were anything but rugged, seriously threatened to prevent the public career he had mapped out.

We find the character of Cicero summed up as follows (368): "Swayed by the impulses of the passing moment, he had the candour to commit to his letters a faithful record of his exultant vanities and pusillanimous despairs. But he was too great an egoist to judge himself and realize his lack of strength". By the side of this might be placed the discerning comment of Asinius Pollio (in Seneca Rhetor, Suasoriae 6): *Utinam moderatius secundas res et fortius adversas ferre potuisset! namque utraeque cum evenerant ei, mutari eas non posse rebatur*.

The author's plan of commenting upon all of Cicero's works in the brief compass allowed results inevitably in giving his account a catalogue effect that impairs the interest of the chapter.

When Professor Duff reaches the Augustan age, he comes to a mine that has been worked and reworked so often that it is difficult to unearth anything new. What newness there is will almost of necessity lie in the method of presentation. Professor Duff's treatment seems to me excellent in this respect. His discussion of each author resembles the introductions of the more comprehensive of our College editions. He presents a biography independently worked up, a list of the writer's works with a brief critique, and a general assessment of his position and influence.

The most beloved writer of the Golden Age, Vergil¹⁹, Professor Duff sets upon a pedestal, and, in a lengthy chapter of fifty pages, turns him around in various lights and shadows in an effort to reveal the various phases of his character. Although he

¹⁹ A valuable analysis of the evolution of the style of pre-Ciceronian orators, so far as the sparse remains permit, may be found in Nettleship, *Lectures and Essays*, Second Series, 93 ff.

¹⁹ Professor Duff uses, of course, the conventional English spelling *Virgil*. Vergil, however, used an *v*, and the reviewer believes that unto Caesar should be rendered the things that are Caesar's. A somewhat similar modern analogue is found in the shortening of the length of the first letter in the name of the great inventor Edison.

discusses at length the composition and the content of the poet's works, he deals only cursorily with that fascinating and perplexing enigma, the 'Messianic' Eclogue. Here he cuts the Gordian knot in expeditious fashion: "Virgil had a confident prevision of the return of a golden age, and under the symbol of the nativity of a divine child he prefigured its dawn". A compressed statement of the basis for his belief as well as some references to recent literature on the subject does, however, appear in a brief foot-note of a dozen lines.

The list of sources for Vergil almost suggests that the Aeneid itself was a cento. Professor Duff, however, very sensibly refrains from any attempt to disparage the poet's originality.

In a separate chapter devoted to the minor poems ascribed to Vergil, he states very briefly the conflicting views respecting their authorship. Like Schanz and other modern scholars, he is inclined to be surgical in his treatment of the Appendix Vergiliana, and he has left but little to the Mantuan bard for future operations.

The life of Vergil's friend, Horace, is pieced together in a fresh and attractive manner from the most satisfactory source available, the poet's own writings. The praise of the Journey to Brundisium may, however, seem somewhat fulsome to those who feel disappointment that something better, *nescio quid praeclarum ac singulare*, did not emanate from the inspiration of such choice and master spirits. In connection with Professor Duff's statement that the vast problems of engineering, financing and other business engrossing the Roman state, while not amenable to poetic treatment, yet manifested their effects on Horace, one recalls a recent remark in a similar vein of F. Hopkinson Smith that conditions were never riper for scholarship than they are to-day, when human voices are being recorded, when the air is yielding to man, when tunnels driven from the bases of mountains meet in the center.

Acting on the suggestion of Ovid's epithet *numerosus*, Professor Duff gives a clever appreciation of the meters selected by Horace and the results produced thereby.

While describing with such sympathy the 'literature of power', Professor Duff does not discriminate against the 'literature of knowledge'. Thus, Roman contributions to scholarship and to science are justly included and appraised. The polymath Varro receives due recognition for his indefatigable labors and for extending the frontiers of knowledge. The important compilation of Verrius Flaccus and the work of Vitruvius and others are likewise noted.

Although the proof-reading has been done very carefully, the inevitable misprints occur. They are, however, found chiefly in the notes and but few would cause trouble.

There is a *lapsus memoriae* in the verb-form in the quotation of the initial sentence of the first Catilinarian oration (357): *Quousque tandem, O Catilina, abuteris patientia nostra?* Professor Duff may be excused for this, however, since a worse fate befell Plato when citing Homer from memory.

These sporadic errors merely betray the human origin of the book, and may be overlooked amid so much that is admirable. The work is, indeed, a *μεγα βιβλίον*, but *μεγα κακόν* is not a corollary of the statement. It seems unlikely that any of Professor Duff's enemies, if he has any, will find cause to rejoice that his adversary has written a book.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA. EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY.

Note on Aeneid 3.514: *auribus aera captat*

The traditional interpretation of this passage represents Palinurus as rising and listening for the wind that should waft them on their way. This is clearly impossible. The scene is laid at the quietest hour of the entire twenty-four; and that Vergil meant to represent it as quiet is clear from the *tacito caelo* of the following verse. Now to hear a wind one must have half a gale. Nowhere are customs more enduring and persistent than among sailor folk. Sailors all over the world determine the direction of a light and uncertain breeze by wetting the lobes of the ears and slowly turning round. That point of the compass toward which the ear feels coldest is the point from which the breeze comes. Vergil probably had in mind this almost universal custom.

B. W. MITCHELL.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, Philadelphia.

In Science for March 6 last there was a brief review of a book, by Roswell Park, entitled *The Evil Eye, Thanatology and Other Essays* (R. G. Badger: Boston, 1913). I have not seen the book, and I can derive no information from the very vague review. But the title reminded me that in early editions of that sterling book, which all teachers of the Classics will surely enjoy, *Roba di Roma*, by the American artist, W. W. Story (Houghton Mifflin Company), there was a valuable chapter on the superstition of the Evil Eye. If Mr. Michael Hezel-tine, the author of an unsatisfactory translation of Petronius in the Loeb Classical Library, had known Mr. Story's book, he would have understood the game called in ancient times *micare digitis*, in modern times *La Morra*, and he would not have written an absurd note on Petronius 44 *sed rectus, sed certus, sed amicus, cum quo audacter posses in tenebris micare*. Mr. Hezel-tine says, "A man who could play it in the dark would be a miracle!" The expression is, rather, a striking way of complimenting a man for unique integrity. This is not the only naive thing in Mr. Hezel-tine's book.

Mr. Story's book deals primarily with modern Rome, but what he says illuminates in countless ways the things of ancient Rome. Chapter I, dealing with the Population of Ancient Rome, was the only good discussion of this subject in English till the publication last year of the fourth volume of the translation of Friedlaender's *Sittengeschichte*, under the title of *Roman Life and Manners* under the *Early Empire* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.47). C. K.